

The rejections state that, "There is no original disclosure for an array of memory cells." The rejection further states that, "It is stated that the device is a regulator but no details are supplied to inform as to how regulation is to be performed."

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits that use of embodiments of Applicant's invention in a memory device are discussed and supported on page 1, lines 8-16. Applicant further submits that one of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that a memory device includes an array of memory cells.

Regarding the regulator, applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that embodiments as described in the specification and claims "regulate" a voltage in a substrate. For example, on page 4, lines 6-9, "The charge pump CP maintains the voltage level of the substrate at that level set by the diode chain. The substrate voltage level is substantially equivalent to the supply voltage Vcc, less any voltage drops across the drain and source of each of the MOSFETs M1, M2, M3, and M5 which are not shorted out of the chain."

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 112, first paragraph rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The rejection states that, "it is not clear what is meant by "array" or "voltage regulator." Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that the claims are definite under the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Applicant respectfully submits that several possible configurations of an "array" of memory cells are enabled and definite to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, applicant has described in the specification numerous configurations of a "voltage regulator" that regulate a voltage in a substrate as mentioned above from page 4, lines 6-9 for example. Pursuant to MPEP § 2173.04, Applicant notes that "breadth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness."

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 21-45 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLaury in view of Bynum et al., Yim et al and Sawamura.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant respectfully requests more detailed references to element numbers and text of the cited documents that the Examiner regards as corresponding to Applicant's claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the level of complexity in the references warrants such detail. Applicant thanks the Examiner in advance for assistance in this matter.

The rejection states that, "McLaury shows apparatus for regulating substrate bias."

McLaury appears to show a diode series 10. The reference also appears to show a diode load element 110. Embodiments of McLaury also appear to show a sense element as part of the integrated circuit. However, Applicant is unable to find at least one **bypass transistor** to at least one diode in a series of diodes for electrically bypassing at least one diode. In contrast, Applicant's independent claims include at least one bypass transistor coupled to at least one diode in a series of diodes for electrically bypassing at least one diode.

The rejection states that, "Bynum et al shows the concept of controlling the bias applied to a substrate by shunting a diode in a line that applies a voltage to a substrate."

Bynum appear to show an integrated circuit designed to bias an epitaxial well. Embodiments of Bynum appear to include a single diode 42. Bynum also appears to show a shunt path in embodiments using the diode. However, Applicant is unable to find at least one **bypass transistor** to at least one diode in a **series of diodes** for electrically bypassing at least one diode. Applicant respectfully submits that a shunt is not equivalent to a bypass transistor. In contrast, Applicant's independent claims include at least one bypass transistor to at least one diode in a series of diodes for electrically bypassing at least one diode.

The rejection states that, "Yim et al shows that plural diodes may be used in a line to tailor the applied voltage."

Yim appears to show a voltage drop stage 10 that includes a plurality of MOSFET's

whose gates are connected with their drains. However, Yim does not show at least one **bypass transistor** to at least one diode in a series of diodes for electrically bypassing at least one diode. In contrast, Applicant's independent claims include at least one bypass transistor to at least one diode in a series of diodes for electrically bypassing at least one diode.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sawamura does not cure the deficiencies of the references discussed above.

Applicant is particularly unable to find the combination of numerous elements in independent claim 21 using the combination of references provided by the examiner. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 103(a) rejection.

Because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not show every element of Applicant's independent claims, a 35 USC § 103(a) rejection is not supported by the references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to Applicant's independent claims 21, 24, 29, 32, 35, 39, and 43. Additionally, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to the remaining claims that depend therefrom as depending on allowable base claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612-373-6944) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

GARY R. GILLIAM

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6944

Date 11-25-02

By 

David C. Peterson
Reg. No. 47,857

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 25th day of November, 2002.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

Amy Moriarty